



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,316	11/14/2000	Lars-Olof Ohberg	1878/00037	4171

7590 07/05/2007
EDWARD A. PENNINGTON
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP
3000 K STREET
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

LEE, BENJAMIN WILLIAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/700,316	Applicant(s) OHBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner Benjamin W. Lee	Art Unit 3714	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL -324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: _____.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


 Kathleen Mosser
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit 3714

Continuation of 11. Regarding the applicant's traversal of claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 101, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The transmission of a value signal is not tangible. Claims 23 and 24 are method claims, so the issue is that the method step of receiving the actual value signal and generating a signal does not produce a tangible result. The signal is generated and nothing further occurs. The examiner notes that the claim does not positively recite a further method step that uses/applies the generated signal.

Regarding the applicant's argument that the combination of Eldridge and Schroeder does not disclose a missile simulator for use during testing of a single aircraft, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Testing two aircraft must include a single aircraft and the claim language does not exclude multiple aircraft.

Regarding the applicant's argument that receiving the target seeker command position at the weapon system is not disclosed by the prior art, the examiner disagrees. Eldridge discloses "lock-on information from the fire control system, directly from the attack aircraft" as was cited in the previous Office Action.

Regarding the applicant's argument that the cited prior art does not disclose simulating behavior of the missile in a computer model to generate an actual value signal adapted to the weapon system, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner maintains that the sections of Eldridge cited in the previous Office Action regarding the aforementioned limitation read on the applicant's claim. Furthermore, the claim language does not limit the computer simulation to occurring only in the attacking aircraft.

The examiner understands that the targeting system of Schroeder is for an actual missile. However, it is obvious to include the features of an actual weapon (the targeting system of Schroeder) in a computer model simulation of an actual weapon (the system of Eldridge) because the targeting system of the actual weapon would obviously provide the most accurate simulation possible (since the system is used in the actual weapon).

Regarding the applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach repeating the steps of simulating behavior of the missile, generating the trouble signal, and using the trouble signal as a control signal for the simulated target seeker, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The repetition of calculations is inherently disclosed in Schroeder in the feedback control system (e.g., Fig. 2). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the feedback control loop diagram of Fig. 2 indicates that the position error correction calculations are repeated until the missile reaches its target.